UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,028	12/30/2003	Brian R. Meyers	MS304770.01 / MSFTP501US	9173

27195 7590 02/06/2008

AMIN. TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER
1900 EAST NINTH STREET
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER	
SHIN, KYUNG H	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/06/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
osteuball@thepatentattorneys.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/750,028	MEYERS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kyung H. Shin	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 December 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 December 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4/7/06, 7/21/05, 5/6/04*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responding to application papers filed on **12-30-2003**.

2. Claims **1 - 40** are pending. Claims **1, 12, 13, 21, 26, 32, 39** are independent.

3. **Claim 6** presented in form of hybrid claims. It will be treated as independent claim, which will include all limitations of their referred claims.

Specification

4. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Claims 6, 26 are objected as "**a computer readable medium**" is not defined clearly in the specification, so that the meaning of the term in the claims is not ascertainable by reference to the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claims **1-5, 9-11, 13-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to **non-statutory** subject matter.

In Claims **1**, "a *device comprising a local agent* ***component..***" is to be construed as computing device of *software per se*, *unless* agent component makes clear in specification that the only reasonable interpretation of the word

"component" is limited to hardware inclusive, tangible, embodiment. It is possible for the corresponding disclosed "component" to cover an embodiment of software alone. (spec. para 32).

In Claims 19, 20, "a ***database"*** is to be construed as *data structure per se*, as failing to fall within a statutory category. (see MPEP 2106.01(1))

As such, the claim is not limited to statutory subject matter and is therefore **non-statutory**. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims **1 - 10, 12 - 17, 19, 20, 32, 33, 35, 36, 39, 40** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by **Panasyuk et al.** (US Patent No. **6,437,803**).

Regarding Claim 1, Panasyuk discloses a system that facilitates controlling a computing device, comprising a local agent component that receives local input device data of one or more local input devices of a local system and routes the local input device data to a remote system for the control thereof with the one or more local input

devices. (col 1, ll 61-63: local agent, remote agent; col 2, ll 4-7: local agent transmits to remote agent messages indicating changes in the remote display within local desktop environment)

Regarding Claim 2, Panasyuk discloses the system of claim 1, the agent component further receives remote system data associated with the remote system that is processed to determine whether to route the local input device data to the remote system. (col 1, ll 61-63: local agent, remote agent; col 1, l 66 - col 2, l 7: remote agent transmits to local agent messages indicating changes for remote system to be incorporated into remote display within the local desktop environment; col. 2, lines 22-29: changes in local desktop transmitted to remote agent, changes in remote desktop transmitted to local agent)

Regarding Claim 3, Panasyuk discloses the system of claim 1, the local input device data is used by the remote system along with remote input device data of one or more remote input devices to facilitate control of the remote system, using at least one of the one or more local input devices, the one or more remote input devices, and a combination of one or more of the local and remote input devices. (col 1, ll 61-63: remote agent; col 1, l 61 - 2, l 4: remote agent input (changes) transmitted to local agent and incorporated into local display of remote desktop; col 2, ll 4-7: local desktop input (changes) incorporated into local display of remote desktop and transmitted to remote agent)

Regarding Claim 4, Panasyuk discloses the system of claim 1, the local agent component communicates with a remote agent component of the remote system to facilitate control of the remote system though the remote agent component. (col 1, ll 61-63: remote agent; col 2, l 66 - col 2, l 4: remote agent transmits changes for remote desktop to display on local desktop display of remote desktop)

Regarding Claim 5, Panasyuk discloses the system of claim 4, the remote agent component signals the local agent component, in response to which the local agent component disengages control of the remote system via the one or more local input devices by routing the local input device data for processing only by the local system. (col 6, l 67 - col 7, l 6: seamless windowing mode is terminated, client node switched back to desktop environment without incorporating windows from other desktop environments)

Regarding Claim 6, Panasyuk discloses a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer executable instructions for carrying out the system of claim 1. (col 10, ll 30-39: computer-readable medium, program)

Regarding Claim 7, Panasyuk discloses the system of claim 1, each of the local system and the remote system is one of a desktop computer, a portable computer, and a handheld portable computing device. (col 1, ll 7-10: remote computer (desktop))

Regarding Claim 8, Panasyuk discloses the system of claim 1, the one or more local input devices comprise a mouse, a keyboard, a trackball, a joystick, a microphone, a touch pad, a pointing stick, a game pad, and a touch screen. (col 1, ll 7-10: remote computer, implies a keyboard)

Regarding Claim 9, Panasyuk discloses the system of claim 1, the local agent component facilitates copying data from the local system to the remote system. (col 2, ll 4-7: local agent transmits messages (data) to remote system)

Regarding Claim 10, Panasyuk discloses the system of claim 1, the local agent component facilitates emulation of a remote display screen of the remote system on the local system. (col 2, ll 8-10: remote desktop environment displayed on local desktop)

Regarding Claim 12, Panasyuk discloses a computer program embodied on a computer readable medium (col 10, ll 30-39: computer readable medium, program) for collaborative control of a remote system by a local system and the remote system, the program comprising a local agent component that receives local input device data of at least one local input device of the local system and routes the local input device data to the remote system to control the remote system with the at least one local input device. (col 1, ll 61-63: local agent, remote agent; col 2, ll 4-7: route local changes to remote system, remote system controlled by local system)

Regarding Claim 13, Panasyuk discloses a system that facilitates control of a second computing system with a first computing system, comprising:

a) a first agent of the first computing system that receives local input device data of a local input device; (col 1, ll 61-63: local agent; col 2, l 4: local agent monitor local desktop) and

b) a second agent of the second computing system that communicates with the first agent to facilitate control of the second computing system, the local input device triggers routing of the local input device data by the first agent to the second agent. (col 1, ll 61-63: remote agents; col 2, ll 4-7: local agent transmits local input (changes to local desktop environment) to remote agent)

Regarding Claim 14, Panasyuk discloses the system of claim 13, the first agent routes the local input device data based upon a location of a pointer associated with at least one of the first computing system and the second computing system, the pointer location coinciding with switching area of a user interface that triggers the first agent to route the input device data. (col 4, ll 30-39: window with focus on local desktop determines which system is in control, if focus window is remote desktop window the local agent transmits messages to remote system)

Regarding Claim 15, Panasyuk discloses the system of claim 14, the switching area is determined manually by a user that configures the physical orientation of the second

computing system to the first computing system, in response to which at least one of the switching area is determined on a display of the first computing system and second switching area is determined on a display of the second computing system. (col 4, ll 30-39: window with focus on local desktop determines which system is in control, if focus window is remote desktop window the local agent transmits messages to remote system)

Regarding Claim 16, Panasyuk discloses the system of claim 14, the switching area is determined automatically by automatically determining the physical orientation of the second computing system to the first computing system, in response to which the first agent determines placement of the switching area on a display of the first computing system. (col 4, ll 30-39: window with focus on local desktop determines which system is in control, if focus window is remote desktop window the local agent transmits messages to remote system)

Regarding Claim 17, Panasyuk discloses the system of claim 13, the first agent routes the local input device data based upon location of a pointer associated with a remote input device of the second computing system, the pointer location matching a location of a display element of the second computing system that triggers the second agent to signal the first agent to route the input device data to the first computing local system only. (col 4, ll 30-39: window with focus on local desktop determines which system is in control, if focus window is remote desktop window the local agent transmits messages

to remote system)

Regarding Claim 19, Panasyuk discloses the system of claim 13, further comprising a database of associations between a user, the first computing system, and the second computing system such that deployment of the second computing system proximate the first computing system automatically facilitates control of the second computing system by the user via the first computing system. (col 1, ll 54-61: remote display within or proximate to local desktop environment, local agent monitors and transmits to remote agent changes in remote display)

Regarding Claim 20, Panasyuk discloses the system of claim 13, further comprising a database disposed at least one of on a network and with the local system, the database receives update information from the first computing system such that deployment of the second computing system on the network triggers automatic update of the second computing system with the update information. (col 6, ll 25-29; col 6, ll 54-57: windowing mode graphical data communicated to client until seamless windowing mode re-established)

Regarding Claim 32, Panasyuk discloses a system that facilitates controlling a computing system, comprising:

a) means for providing an agent for a first system, which agent receives input device data of one or more input devices of the first system; (col 2, ll 4-7: local agent transmits to remote agent changes; col 10, lines 30-39: program) and

b) means for signaling the agent to route the input device data to at least a second system; (col 3, ll 42-49: agents monitor desktop environment for changes)

c) means for routing the input device data to the second system for processing; (col 2, ll 4-7: local agent transmits messages to remote agent indicating changes in remote system; col 10, lines 30-39: program)

d) means for presenting objects displayed by the second system, on a display of the first system; (col 1, ll 59-61: remote desktop incorporated into a local desktop environment; col 10, lines 30-39: program) and

e) means for controlling the second system via the display of the first system. (col 2, ll 4-7: local agent transmits messages to remote agent indicating changes in remote desktop in local desktop environment; col 10, lines 30-39: program)

Regarding Claim 33, Panasyuk discloses the system of claim 32, the means for presenting is performed by emulating a user interface of the second system. (col 1, ll 59-61: remote desktop (user interface) windows from second system displayed on local desktop)

Regarding Claim 35, Panasyuk discloses the system of claim 32, the means for signaling is a button or a key of an input device the is selected. (col 1, ll 7-10: remote

computer implies computer system with a keyboard)

Regarding Claim 36, Panasyuk discloses the system of claim 32, the means for routing further comprises a second agent means of the second system that facilitates routing of the input device data to an input of the second system for the control thereof. (col 1, ll 61-63: remote (second) agent; col 2, ll 4-7: local input messages transmitted (routed) to remote system)

Regarding Claim 39, Panasyuk discloses a computer program stored on a computer readable medium (col 10, ll 30-39: computer readable medium, program) for the collaboration of disparate computing systems, comprising an agent component of a first computing system that facilitates the routing of at least one of input device data of the first system and content data of the first system to select ones of a plurality of remote computing systems. (col 3, ll 13-14; col 3, ll 20-27: multiple servers (remote agents) displayed on one local desktop)

Regarding Claim 40, Panasyuk discloses the computer program of claim 39, the select ones of the plurality of computing systems include one of computing systems currently being used and computing systems of a designated group. (col 1, ll 59-63: local desktop, a system currently being used; col 3, ll 20-27: multiple server (remote) systems, part of a server group or category)

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claim **11** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Panasyuk** in view of **Deshpande** (US Patent No. **7,171,444**).

Regarding Claim 11, Panasyuk discloses the system of claim 1, the local agent component facilitates an interface on the local system to control the remote system. (col 1, ll 59-61: local desktop displays remote system; col 2, ll 1-6: local desktop transmits and receives message to control remote system) Panasyuk does not specifically disclose a touch pad interface. However, Deshpande discloses emulation of a touch pad interface. (Deshpande col 1, ll 23-27: touch screen)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Panasyuk as taught by Deshpande to use a touch pad interface. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Deshpande in order to provide adequate playback by eliminating bandwidth constraints. (Deshpande col 2, ll 42-47: " *... Many thin client systems fail to achieve adequate playback due to the bandwidth constraints and the way in which that bandwidth is used. The present invention*

addresses this and other problems associated with the prior art. ... ")

11. Claims **18, 21 - 31, 37, 38** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Panasyuk** in view of **Beged-Dov et al.** (US Patent No. **6,983,328**). **Regarding Claim 18**, Panasyuk discloses the system of claim 13, the first agent facilitates copying data from the first computing system to the second computing system by encapsulating data and transmitting the encapsulated data to the second agent. (col 2, ll 4-7: local agent transmits messages to remote agent) Panasyuk does not specifically disclose copying of clipboard data from the first computing system to the second computing system. However, Beged-Dov discloses copying of clipboard data from the first computing system to the second computing system by encapsulating the clipboard data and transmitting the encapsulated clipboard data, verifies that the clipboard data can be copied to the second computing system. (Beged-Dov col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 39-50: copy function; col 5, ll 36-49: past function; col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 30-33: verifies user identity at copy system (first system); col 5, ll 17-18: verifies user identity at paste system (second system))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Panasyuk as taught by Beged-Dov to copy clipboard data from the first computing system to the second computing system. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Beged-Dov in order for a method and system to facilitate the efficient and secure transfer of resources. (Beged-Dov col 1, ll 19-20; col 2, ll 4-6)

Regarding Claim 21, Panasyuk discloses a method of controlling a computing system, comprising: providing a first agent of a first system, which agent facilitates the routing of clipboard data from the first system; and routing the clipboard data to a second system in response to a routing signal. (col 1, ll 61-63: local agent) However, Beged-Dov discloses routing of clipboard data from the first system; and routing the clipboard data to a second system in response to a routing signal. (Beged-Dov col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 39-50: copy function; col 5, ll 36-49: past function; col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Panasyuk as taught by Beged-Dov to route clipboard data from the first system to a second system. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Beged-Dov in order for a method and system to facilitate the efficient and secure transfer of resources. (Beged-Dov col 1, ll 19-20; col 2, ll 4-6)

Regarding Claim 22, Panasyuk discloses the method of claim 21, further comprising authenticating the second system before routing data thereto, wherein routing are performed one of automatically and manually. (col 1 , l 66 - col 2, l 4; col 2, ll 4-7: remote agent transmits messages of changes to remote desktop environment to local desktop, local agent transmits messages to remote agent of changes to remote display in local desktop) Panasyuk does not specifically disclose routing the clipboard data, and authentication performed. However, Beged-Dov discloses routing the clipboard

data, and authentication performed. (Beged-Dov col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 39-50: copy function; col 5, ll 36-49: paste function; col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Panasyuk as taught by Beged-Dov to route clipboard data from the first system to a second system. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Beged-Dov in order for a method and system to facilitate the efficient and secure transfer of resources. (Beged-Dov col 1, ll 19-20; col 2, ll 4-6)

Regarding Claim 23, Panasyuk discloses the method of claim 19, further comprising routing data from the first system to a plurality of other systems. (col 4, ll 54-56; col 4, ll 60-63: change message (data) routed from server agent to registered client agents) Panasyuk does not specifically disclose routing the clipboard data from the first system to another system. However, Beged-Dov discloses routing the clipboard data from the first system to another system. (Beged-Dov col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 39-50: copy function; col 5, ll 36-49: past function; col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Panasyuk as taught by Beged-Dov to route clipboard data from the first system to a second system. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Beged-Dov in order for a method and system to facilitate the efficient and secure transfer of resources. (Beged-Dov col 1, ll 19-20; col 2, ll 4-6)

Regarding Claim 24, Panasyuk discloses the method of claim 19, the first agent facilitates routing of data to the second system. (col 1, ll 61-63: local and remote agents; col 2, ll 4-7: messaging between local (first) agent and remote agent on second system) Panasyuk does not specifically disclose routing of the clipboard data by further encapsulating the clipboard data and transmitting the encapsulated clipboard data to the second system. However, Beged-Dov discloses routing of the clipboard data by further encapsulating the clipboard data and transmitting the encapsulated clipboard data to the second system. (Beged-Dov col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 39-50: copy function; col 5, ll 36-49: past function; col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Panasyuk as taught by Beged-Dov for routing of the clipboard data. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Beged-Dov in order for a method and system to facilitate the efficient and secure transfer of resources. (Beged-Dov col 1, ll 19-20; col 2, ll 4-6)

Regarding Claim 25, Panasyuk discloses the method of claim 19, further comprising routing data from the first system to one or more other systems that are currently in use. (col 1, ll 61-63: local and remote agents; col 2, ll 4-7: messaging between local (first) agent and remote agent on another system) Panasyuk does not specifically disclose routing the clipboard data. However, Beged-Dov discloses routing the clipboard data.

(Beged-Dov col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 39-50: copy function; col 5, ll 36-49: past function; col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Panasyuk as taught by Beged-Dov for routing of the clipboard data. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Beged-Dov in order for a method and system to facilitate the efficient and secure transfer of resources. (Beged-Dov col 1, ll 19-20; col 2, ll 4-6)

Regarding Claim 26, Panasyuk discloses a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions (col 10, ll 30-39: computer-readable medium, program) for performing a method for controlling a computer, the method comprising: receiving at least one of input device data and associated with a first agent of a first computing system (col 2, l 4: local agent monitors local desktop); and switching at least one of the input device data to a second computing system based upon the input device data. (col 2, ll 4-7: local agent transmits messages to remote agent indicating changes in local desktop)

Panasyuk does not specifically disclose receiving clipboard data and switching clipboard data to a second computing system. However, Beged-Dov discloses receiving clipboard data and switching clipboard data to a second computing system. (Beged-Dov col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 39-50:

copy function; col 5, ll 36-49: past function; col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Panasyuk as taught by Beged-Dov to receiving clipboard data and switching clipboard data to a second computing system. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Beged-Dov in order for a method and system to facilitate the efficient and secure transfer of resources. (Beged-Dov col 1, ll 19-20; col 2, ll 4-6)

Regarding Claim 27, Panasyuk discloses the method of claim 26, further comprising a display of the first computing system to facilitate control of the second computing system. (col 1, ll 59-61: incorporate windows of a remote desktop environment into a local desktop environment) Panasyuk does not specifically disclose a touch pad. However, Deshpande discloses a touch pad. (Deshpande col 1, ll 23-27: touch screen)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Panasyuk as taught by Deshpande to use a touch pad. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Deshpande in order to provide adequate playback by eliminating bandwidth constraints. (Deshpande col 2, ll 42-47)

Regarding Claim 28, Panasyuk discloses the method of claim 26, further comprising tracking a location of the second computing system such that placement of the second computing system proximate to the first computing system causes the first agent to automatically facilitate control of the second system. (col 1, ll 54-61: remote display

within or proximate to local desktop environment, local agent monitors and transmits to remote agent changes in remote display)

Regarding Claim 29, Panasyuk discloses the method of claim 26, further comprising configuring the first agent by designating one or more locations on a display screen of the first computing system to trigger routing of the input device data to the second system. (col 4, ll 30-39: window with focus on local desktop determines which system is in control, if focus window is remote desktop window the local agent transmits messages to remote system)

Regarding Claim 30, Panasyuk discloses the method of claim 29, the one or more locations include at least one of a display element and an icon that are associated with triggering the first agent to route the input device data to the second computing system. (col 4, ll 35-37: focus location is a display window or display element; col 3, ll 15-18: windows graphical user interface implies an icon)

Regarding Claim 31, Panasyuk discloses the method of claim 26, the first system is a computer. (col 1, ll 7-10; col 1, lines 59-61: computers, desktop implies a windows based computer system) Panasyuk does not specifically disclose a stylus-based mobile device. However, Deshpande discloses a stylus based mobile computer. (Deshpande col 1, ll 23-27: touch screen implies a stylus based portable device)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Panasyuk as taught by Deshpande to use a touch pad interface. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Deshpande in order to provide adequate playback by eliminating bandwidth constraints. (Deshpande col 2, ll 42-47)

Regarding Claim 37, Panasyuk discloses the system of claim 32, including a second agent and means. (col 1, ll 61-63: remote (second) agent; col 10, ll 30-39: means, software implementation) However, Beged-Dov discloses further comprising automatically routing clipboard content from the first system to the second system (col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 39-50: copy function; col 5, ll 36-49: past function; col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste), the second system verifies that the clipboard content can be received at the second system. (col 4, ll 30-33: verifies user identity at copy system (first system); col 5, ll 17-18: verifies user identity at paste system (second system))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Panasyuk as taught by Beged-Dov to verify content can be received. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Beged-Dov in order for a method and system to facilitate the efficient and secure transfer of resources. (Beged-Dov col 1, ll 19-20; col 2, ll 4-6)

Regarding Claim 38, Panasyuk discloses the system of claim 37, the agent initiates emulation of a display of the second system on the first system, the emulation provides

one or more icons for selection by a user of the first system. (col 1, ll 59-61: remote desktop displayed on local desktop display; col 3, ll 15-20: windows graphical user interface implies icon in display)

12. Claim **34** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Panasyuk-Beged-Dov** and further in view of **Deshpande**.

Regarding Claim 34, Panasyuk discloses the system of claim 33, the user interface. (col 3, ll 15-18: display is a windows graphical user interface) Panasyuk does not specifically disclose a touch pad interface and a touch screen interface. However, Deshpande discloses a touch pad interface and a touch screen interface. (Deshpande col 1, ll 23-27: touch screen)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Panasyuk as taught by Deshpande to use a touch pad interface and a touch screen interface. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Deshpande in order to provide adequate playback by eliminating bandwidth constraints. (Deshpande col 2, ll 42-47)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyung H. Shin whose telephone number is (571) 272-3920. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 am - 6 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

K H S
Kyung Hye Shin
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2143

KHS
January 30, 2008

/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/
Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2152
February 1, 2008